



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,011	07/23/2003	Abraham B. de Waal	NVDA/P000654	9953
26291	7590	11/25/2009	EXAMINER	
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN L.L.P. NJ Office			TRAN, TUYETLIEN T	
3040 Post Oak Boulevard				
Suite 1500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Houston, TX 77056-6582			2179	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/25/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Ktaboada@pattersonsheridan.com
psdocketing@pattersonsheridan.com
PAIR_eOfficeAction@pattersonsheridan.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/626,011	DE WAAL, ABRAHAM B.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TUYETLIEN T. TRAN	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 52-70 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 52-70 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment filed 08/27/09.

This action is made final.

2. Claims 52-70 are pending in the case. Claims 52, 60, 68 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. **Claims 52-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drenttel et al. (Patent No. US 7124360 B1; hereinafter Drenttel) in view of Butler et al. (Patent No. 6018340; hereinafter Butler).**

As to claims 52, Drenttel teaches:

A method for organizing one or more application windows within at least one computer display (e.g., Figs. 9a-9c and col. 7 lines 57-67), the method comprising:

dividing the at least one computer display with one or more user-defined boundaries to create two or more window areas within the at least one computer display (e.g., Figs. 9a-9c and col. 5 lines 1-44; the display screen is divided into grids having two or more window areas and wherein the grid templates are user-configurable, col. 6 lines 56-67);

associating a first application window with a first window area within the at least one computer display based on user input (e.g., Fig. 9b and col. 6 lines 56-67 through col. 7 lines 1-28 and col. 7 lines 35-47 and lines 57-67; wherein the first section of the screen 9012 is configured to display email information or wherein each frame being used to display data as desired and wherein the user can reconfigure and reorganize the mosaic of information);

associating a second application window with the first window area within the at least two computer displays based on user input (e.g., see Figs. 2A-2Ab and col. 6 lines 23-55; wherein an area grid can be configured to subdivided into smaller grid; therefore, area 30 in Fig. 2A can configure to contain two application windows as shown in Fig. 2Aa, 2Ab);

displaying the first application window and the second application window within the first window area within the at least one computer display based on user input (e.g., Figs. 9a-9c and col. 7 lines 35-67; wherein each grid/frame is used to display data as desired).

Drenttel discloses that an application window is associated with a specific mat object; for example, Email application and Web Browser application are associated to mat object 9012 and 9011, respectively (e.g., Figs. 9a-9c and col. 7 lines 48-67). Drenttel does not disclose that the window area is extended across a first computer display and a second computer display wherein a first portion of the first window area is displayed within a first of the at least two computer displays and a second portion of the first window area is displayed within a second of the at least two computer displays.

In the same field of endeavor of displaying multiple windows, Butler discloses a window area associating with an application window (e.g., window area C as shown in Fig. 4) wherein the window area is extended across two computer displays such that a first portion of the first window area is within a first computer display and a second portion of the first window area is within a second computer display (e.g., window area C in Fig. 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the grid template as taught by Drenttel to be able to use for a multiple displays as suggested by Butler to achieve the ability to display multiple application windows in a multiple displays environment because Butler suggests that the combination of the monitor spaces can be treated as a single, contiguous virtual desktop (e.g., see Butler col. 1 lines 54-59) and Drenttel also suggested that the grid template can be applicable to larger and varying screen sizes and proportions (e.g., see Drenttel col. 5 lines 35-44). As suggested by Butler, one would have been motivated to make such a combination is to reduce the screen clutter (e.g., see Butler col. 1 lines 42-51).

In regard to claim 60, claim 60 reflects the computer readable medium-comprising software instruction for performing the method steps as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claim 68, claim 68 reflects the system-comprising a processor, a computer monitor, a user interface coupled to the processor for performing the method steps as claimed in claim 1, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 53 and 61, Drenttel teaches storing the one or more user-defined boundaries as a boundary layout template that is available for recall by the user (e.g., col. 6 lines 23-67).

In regard to claims 54 and 62, Drenttel teaches adjusting the length associated with a first user-defined boundary in the one or more user-defined boundaries, and adjusting the two or more window areas based on the adjusted length associated with the first user-defined boundary (e.g., col. 6 lines 56-67 through col. 8 lines 1-4).

In regard to claims 55 and 63, Drenttel teaches storing the association between the first application window and the first window area within the at least one computer (e.g., Figs. 9a-9c and col. 7 lines 57-67 through col. 8 lines 1-5).

In regard to claims 56 and 64, Drenttel teaches resizing the first application window to cover an entire area of the first window area within the at least one computer (e.g., Figs. 9a-9c and col. 7 lines 57-67 through col. 8 lines 1-5 and col. 5 lines 14-16).

In regard to claims 57 and 65, Drenttel further teaches resizing the first application window to cover a first portion of the first window area (e.g., Figs. 9a-9c and col. 7 lines 35-67). Drenttel does not teach the area defined by the first portion is less than an entire area of the first window area within the at least one computer. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to have implemented this limitation because Drenttel suggests to the skilled artisan that the grid template can be rearranged, reconfigured and reorganized as desired by the end user to suit his or her needs and/or tastes (e.g., col. 6 lines 56-67 through col. 7 lines 1-3). One would have been motivated to make such

an implementation is to increase the user understanding of, and relationship to, a computer interface through a computer screen (e.g., Drenttel col. 2 lines 23-26).

In regard to claims 58 and 66, Drenttel the one or more user-defined boundaries are associated with a pre-defined boundary layout template selected by the user (e.g., col. 6 lines 23-67 through col. 7 lines 1-3).

In regard to claims 59 and 67, Drenttel further discloses each of the one or more user-defined boundaries extends between two different sides of the at least one computer display (e.g., Figs. 9a-9c; wherein the boundary of window area 9001' extends between two different sides, left to right side, of the computer screen where the template area covers). Butler discloses a multiple display system having a plurality of window areas extending across multiple monitors (e.g., see Fig. 4). Butler suggests that the combination of the monitor spaces can be treated as a single, contiguous virtual desktop (e.g., see col. 1 lines 54-59). Thus, combining Drenttel and Butler would meet the claimed limitations, wherein at least one of the one or more user-defined boundaries extends between two difference sides of one of the at least two computer displays, for the same reasons as set forth in the foregoing rejection of claim 1.

6. Claim 69 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drenttel in view of Butler further in view of Santoro et al. (US 6724403 B1; hereinafter Santoro).

In regard to claim 69, Drenttel and Butler teach the limitations of claim 69 for the same reasons as set forth in claim 52 above. Drenttel and Butler do not teach a second window area, wherein the first window area partially overlaps the second window area.

However, this deficiency is disclosed by Santoro wherein Santoto teaches user-defined boundaries (e.g., Fig. 1 and col. 13 lines 28-30). Santoro teaches the user-defined boundaries

having two or more window areas (e.g 11788673., tiles) to display one or more application windows (e.g., Fig. 1). Santoro teaches a window area partially overlaps another window area in the grid display (e.g., col. 9 lines 43-56). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the layout grid template of Drenttel and Butler to include the feature of overlapping window area to achieve the claimed invention. One would have been motivated to make such an implementation is to make it easier to view the content displayed in the window area (e.g., see Santoro col. 9 lines 54-56).

7. Claim 70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drenttel in view of Butler further in view of DeStefano (6075531; DeStefano).

In regard to claim 69, Drenttel and Butler teach the limitations of claim 69 for the same reasons as set forth in claim 52 above. Drenttel and Butler do not teach at least one of the one or more user-defined boundaries is not a straight line.

However, this deficiency is disclosed by DeStefano. DeStefano teaches a display area having multiple windows (e.g., see Fig. 10). DeStefano teaches a window boundary can be in other shapes such as linear or curved (e.g., col. 4 lines 23-43). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the layout grid template of Drenttel and Butler to include the feature of defining window boundaries to be in curved lines to achieve the claimed invention. One would have been motivated to make such an implementation is to optimize the available space of the display area since content displayed in the window area is not always in a straight shaped format.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's remarks filed on 08/27/09 have been considered but are not persuasive.

- ◆ Applicants argue that the combination of Drenttel does not disclose the limitations of “displaying the first application window and the second application window within the first window area” (e.g., see Applicant’s remark pages 6-7).

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As seen in Fig. 2A, Drenttel teaches dividing the at least one computer display with one or more user-defined boundaries to create two or more window areas 30 (see Fig. 2A). Drenttel teaches the two or more window areas 30 can be modified to divide into smaller areas 50 (see Fig. 2Aa, 2Ab and col. 6 lines 23-55). Drenttel teaches associating an application window with areas 50 (e.g., Fig. 9b and col. 6 lines 56-67 through col. 7 lines 1-28 and col. 7 lines 35-47 and lines 57-67; wherein the first section of the screen 9012 is configured to display email information or wherein each frame being used to display data as desired and wherein the user can reconfigure and reorganize the mosaic of information). Because there are at least 2 areas 50 in the window area 30 and each area 50 can be configured by the user to associate with an application window, Drenttel teaches associating first and second application window with the window area 30. Therefore, the application maintains the position on claims 52, 60 and 68.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. *In re Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33,216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting *In re Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275,277 (CCPA 1968)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-270-1033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday: 7:30 - 5:00 (every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TuyetLien T Tran/

Examiner, Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179